

Application No. 10/724,690
Amendment dated _____
After Final Office Action of September 27, 2006

Docket No.: 1381-0304P

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached is a new sheet of drawing.

Attachment: Correction to Fig. 1

REMARKS

Claims 8-17 are pending. By this response, claims 1-7 are cancelled and claims 8-17 added, the specification is amended and Fig. 1 corrected. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Distinct Invention

The Examiner alleges that the added claims 8-17 are directed to a distinct invention from original claims 1-7. The Examiner asserts that new claims 8-17 are directed to a system which "takes care" of telecommunications while claims 8-17 are directed "one stop billing." Applicants respectfully disagree that claim 8-17 are directed to a distinct invention from original claims 1-7.

The advisory action dated January 22, 2007, appears to clarify the above assertion by stating that the "installation of automated devices" language of the new claims is not part of the original claimed language which were directed to including telecommunication connections, monitoring, maintaining and billing of the telecommunication connections, and automated devices.

In view of the above Applicants note new claims 8-17 in this Response have been modified to address the concerns of the examiner. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit claims 8-17 and original claims 1-7 are each directed to the same inventive concepts. Thus, examination of claims 8-17 is respectfully requested.

New Matter

The Examiner objects to the addition of newly added Fig. 1 and reference thereto on page 6 of the specification as adding new matter.

Applicants note that Fig. 1 and the specification have been modified from the original submitted Fig. 1 and specification amendments that were not entered. Applicants submit that the drawing is directed to the features of the new claims, while the addition to the specification refers to the drawing. Applicants submit that each feature of the drawing and a description were originally disclosed in the specification and/or original claims and thus does not add any new matter.

Therefore, in view of the above Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 1 and its description in the specification are not new matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and New Claim 8-17

The Office Action objects to claims 4-7 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) the improper multiple dependent claims; claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wilson (U.S. 6,578,675) and claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamada (U.S. 2002/0173970). These objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 1-7 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the objections and rejections to these claims are now moot.

Applicants note that although claims 1-7 have been cancelled, claims 8-17 are directed to the same embodiments. However, in an attempt to expedite prosecution of the application comments on the differences between the present invention and Wilson and Hamada is provided below.

In embodiments of the present invention, a business/company contracts with a client to performs the monitoring and maintenance of the devices. The business also includes telecommunication connection and equipment within the automated devices and monitoring equipment for monitoring the telecommunication equipment and automated device. The business then establishes a network service and handles the third party service arrangements. The business will also perform the monitoring and operation of the telecommunication connection , equipment and automated devices. The business then invoices in a single bill all services rendered to the client. Therefore, a client only has to contract with the business to obtain all the above advantages.

In contrast, Wilson teaches an elevator on which a business installs a computer, monitor and camera. The elevator is connected to a mainframe network server via a telephone line. The server sends advertising messages to the elevator to be displayed on the monitor. The system provider performs the installation, maintenance/service and billing of the advertising system. The system provider, however, does not perform monitoring and service of the elevator itself and the telecommunication equipment along with providing a single bill for all of the above services and monitoring.

Hamada teaches a system in which a customer can contact a service company via a network and submit a particular service plan for an existing elevator. The service plan may include maintenance and monitoring of the system. The company can connect

to the customer via a network (telephone, data line, etc.). The service system of Hamada, however, does not perform the inclusion of telecommunication connections and maintenance of the telecommunication equipment or telecommunication network connections.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 1.136(a), The Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$450.00 is being filed concurrently herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By *Michael K. Mutter* 48,917
for Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant